GARY R. HERBERT
Governor

SPENCER J. COX
Lieutenant Governor

State of Utah
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

MICHAEL R. STYLER
Executive Director

Division of Oil, Gas and Mining
JOHN R. BAZA
Division Director

June 22, 2016

CERTIFIED RETURN RECEIPT
7013 2250 0000 2310 2422

Erez Goldbraber
Bromide Mining, LLC
80 Southwest 8th ST STE 2000
Miami, FL 33130

Subject: Proposed Assessment for State Notice of Violation No. MC-2016-42-02, Bromide Mining, LLC, Bromide Basin Mine, S/017/0031, Garfield County, Utah

Response Due By: 30 Days of Receipt

Dear Mr.Goldbraber:

The undersigned has been appointed by the Division of Oil, Gas & Mining as the assessment officer for assessing penalties under R647-7.

Enclosed is the proposed civil penalty assessment for the above referenced cessation order (CO). The CO was issued by Division inspector, Wayne Western, on March 9, 2016 (received by the operator March 15, 2016). Rule R647-7-103 et. seq. has been utilized to determine the proposed penalty of $2,750.00. The enclosed worksheet outlines how the civil penalty was assessed.

By these rules, any written information which was submitted by you or your agent within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this NOV has been considered in determining the facts surrounding the violation and the amount of this penalty.

Under R647-7-106, there are two informal appeal options available to you. You may appeal the 'fact of the violation', the proposed civil penalty, or both. If you wish to informally appeal you should file a written request for an informal conference within thirty 30 days of receipt of this letter.

1594 West North Temple, Suite 1210, Salt Lake City, UT 84116
PO Box 145801, Salt Lake City, UT 84114-5801
telephone (801) 538-5340 • facsimile (801) 359-3940 • TTY (801) 538-7458 • *www.ogm.utah.gov*

UTAH DNR
OIL, GAS & MINING

The informal conference will be conducted by a Division-appointed conference officer. The informal conference for the fact of the violation is distinct from the informal assessment conference regarding the proposed penalty. If you wish to review both the fact of the violation and proposed penalty assessment, you should file a written request for an assessment conference within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter. In this case, the assessment conference will be scheduled immediately following the review of the fact of the violation.

If a timely request for review is not made, the fact of the violation will stand, the proposed penalty will become final, and will be due and payable within thirty (30) days of the date of this proposed assessment (by October 5, 2015). Please remit payment to the Division, mail c/o Sheri Sasaki.

Sincerely,

Lynn Kunzler
Assessment Officer

LK: eb
Enclosure: Proposed assessment worksheet
cc: Sheri Sasaki, Accounting
Vickie Southwick, Exec. Sec.
P:\GROUPS\MINERALS\WP\M017-Garfield\S0170031-Bromidebasin\non-compliance\MC2016-42-02\passltr-7242-03282016.doc

WORKSHEET FOR ASSESSMENT OF PENALTIES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS & MINING
Minerals Regulatory Program

NOV / CO #: MC-2016-42-02 PERMIT: S/017/0031
COMPANY / MINE Bromide Mining, LLC / Bromide Basin Mine

ASSESSMENT DATE June 21, 2016
ASSESSMENT OFFICER Lynn Kunzler

I. HISTORY (Max. 25 pts.) (R647–7-103.2.11)

A. Are there previous violations, which are not pending or vacated, which fall three (3) years of today's date?

PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS	EFFECTIVE DATE	POINTS (1pt for NOV 5pts for CO)
MC-2013-42-03	07/21/2014	5
MN-2015-42-03	03/01/2016	1
MC-2015-42-06	03/01/2016	5

TOTAL HISTORY POINTS 11

II. SERIOUSNESS (Max 45pts) (R647–7-103.2.12)

NOTE: For assignment of points in Parts II and III, the following apply:
1. Based on facts supplied by the inspector, the Assessment Officer will determine within each category where the violation falls.
2. Beginning at the mid-point of the category, the Assessment Officer will adjust the points up or down, utilizing the inspector=s and operator=s statements as guiding documents.

Is this an EVENT (A) or Administrative (B) violation? Event (A)
(assign points according to A or B)

A. EVENT VIOLATIONS (Max 45 pts.)

1. What is the event which the violated standard was designed to prevent?
Conducting activities outside of, and/or without appropriate approvals, and environmental harm.

2. What is the probability of the occurrence of the event which a violated standard was designed to prevent?

PROBABILITY	POINT RANGE
None	0
Unlikely	1-9
Likely	10-19
Occurred	20

ASSIGN PROBABILITY OF OCCURRENCE POINTS 20

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:
Inspector indicated that mining activities (exploration drilling) have again occurred outside the permitted and bonded area. Points assigned considered the event occurred.

3. What is the extent of actual or potential damage:
Disturbances outside the permit area involved exploration drilling. While the area had previously be disturbed (surface), it was outside the permitted and bonded area. Also, the operator did not provide surety for hole plugging costs, which, if not properly plugged could result in groundwater impacts.

ASSIGN DAMAGE POINTS(RANGE 0-25) **12**

In assigning points, consider the duration and extent of said damage or impact, in terms of area and impact on the public or environment.

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

Actual damage has not occurred, but without assurance (bond) of drill holes being properly plugged, potential damage and impacts to the ground water system could be extensive. Points are assigned at the mid-point of the range to reflect both the potential impacts as well as the apparent lack of any impact at the current time.

B. ADMINISTRATIVE VIOLATIONS (Max 25pts)

1. Is this a POTENTIAL or ACTUAL hindrance to enforcement? _____

Assign points based on the extent to which enforcement is actually or potentially hindered by the violation.

ASSIGN HINDRANCE POINTS NA

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS: _

TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS (A or B) 32

III. DEGREE OF FAULT (Max 30 pts.) (R647-7-103.2.13)

A. IF SO--NO NEGLIGENCE; or, , IF SO--GREATER DEGREE OF FAULT THAN NEGLIGENCE.

	Point Range
No Negligence (Was this an inadvertent violation which was unavoidable by the exercise of reasonable care?)	0
Negligence (was this a failure of a permittee to prevent the occurrence of a violation due to indifference lack of diligence, or lack of reasonable care?)	1-15
Greater Degree of Fault (was this a failure to abate any violation or was economic gain realized by the permittee?	16-30

STATE DEGREE OF NEGLIGENCE *Negligence*

ASSIGN NEGLIGENCE POINTS 15

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

This is the 2nd time this operation has been cited for activities outside the permitted/bonded area, demonstrating a higher level of negligence. Points assigned at the upper limit of the 'Negligence' range.

IV. GOOD FAITH (Max 20 pts.) (R467-7-103.2.14)

(Either A or B) (Does not apply to violations requiring no abatement measures, or violations not abated at the time of assessment)

Has Violation Been Abated? Yes

A. EASY ABATEMENT (The operator had onsite, the resources necessary to achieve compliance of the violated standard within the permit area.)

	Point Range
Immediate Compliance (Immediately following the issuance of the NOV)	-11 to -20
Rapid Compliance (Permittee used diligence to abate the violation. Violation abated in less time than allotted.)	-1 to -10
Normal Compliance (Operator complied within the abatement period required, or, Operator requested an extension to abatement time)	0

B. DIFFICULT ABATEMENT (The operator did not have the resources at hand to achieve compliance, or the submission of plans was required prior to physical activity to achieve compliance.)

	Point Range
Rapid Compliance (Permittee used diligence to abate the violation. Violation abated in less time than allotted.)	-11 to -20
Normal Compliance (Operator complied within the abatement period)	-1 to -10
Extended Compliance (Operator complied within the abatement period required, or, Operator requested an extension to abatement time) (Permittee took minimal actions for abatement to stay within the limits of the violation, or the plan submitted for abatement was incomplete.)	0

EASY OR DIFFICULT ABATEMENT? Difficult abatement – plans were required.

ASSIGN GOOD FAITH POINTS 13

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS: *Operator had one month from the date the CO was received to abate the violation. The Division received the amendment to the NOI and the check for the surety increase one week before the abatement date. Points were awarded proportionately to the time allotted for rapid compliance*

V. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY (R647-7-103.3)

I.	TOTAL HISTORY POINTS	11
II.	TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS	32
III.	TOTAL NEGLIGENCE POINTS	15
IV.	TOTAL GOOD FAITH POINTS	-13
	TOTAL ASSESSED POINTS	45

TOTAL ASSESSED FINE **$2750.00**